

**REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11-17, 19-25 and 31-38, objected to claim 10 for containing allowable subject matter but being dependent on a rejected base claim, and allowed claims 26-30. Applicants thank the Examiner for noting the allowable subject matter recited in the instant claims. By the present Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 17, 20, 22, and 31 and have canceled claim 21 without prejudice. In summary, claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11-17, 19-20, and 22-38 remain pending in the present application. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the present invention. Specifically, the Examiner rejected claim 5 for depending from a cancelled claim. By the present Response, Applicants have amended claim 5 to depend from independent claim 1, and this amendment is believed to overcome the Examiner's rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the Section 112 rejection of claim 5.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17, 19, 20, 23, 24 and 31-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by each of the Zaber, Kofflin and Neimi references. Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19-22, 31 and 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Arosio reference. As discussed further below, Applicants respectfully assert that all pending claims are patentable over the cited references and, as such, in condition for allowance.

Anticipation under Section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). For a prior art reference to anticipate under Section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). To maintain a proper rejection under Section 102, a single reference must teach each and every element or step of the rejected claim. *Atlas Powder v. E.I. du Pont*, 750 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Thus, if the claims recite even one element not found in the cited reference, the reference does not anticipate the claimed invention. As demonstrated below, Applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims recite features not found in any of the cited references.

#### **First Section 102 Rejection**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 31-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Zaber reference (U.S. Patent No. 2,951,717; hereinafter “Zaber”). Applicants, however, respectfully assert that the pending claims recite features not found in Zaber and, as such, are not anticipated by Zaber.

For example, Zaber does not disclose a member that is pivotally coupled to the body of the connector and that includes a slot having a camming surface, as is recited in independent claims 17 and 20. Rather, in the device of Zaber only the axially moveable latch 17 includes a slot 21. *See* Zaber, col. 4, ll. 8-10; Fig. 3. Each latch 17 of Zaber is mounted in guideways that restrict the movement of the latch to axial directions. *See id.* at col. 3, l. 74 to col. 4, l. 6. Indeed, Zaber states that the “longitudinal marginal edges of the latch are slidably confined within the guideway formed by the plate 15 and the L-shaped plates 12 so that the latch may be displaced in an axial direction.” *See id.* at col. 4, ll. 2-6 (emphasis added). Thus, in the device of Zaber, the only member that includes a slot is limited to axial displacement with respect to the body it is engaged to. As such, Zaber does not disclose a pivotable member that includes a slot, let alone a pivotable member that includes a slot that defines a camming surface.

Additionally, Zaber does not disclose a camming surface that defines the axial position of a hook member, as is recited in independent claims 17, 20, and 31. Rather, in the Zaber device, the position of the latch 17 is defined solely by the latch's relationship with respect to an offset, circularly-moving crank end 11. *See* Zaber, Figs. 5 and 6 (noting the circular path of travel of the crank end 11). To axially move the latch 17 of Zaber, a user must rotate handle 22. *See* Zaber, col. 4, ll. 36-40. Rotation of this handle 22 causes a crank end 11 to travel in a circular path. *See id.* at col. 4, ll. 8-20. That is, the crank end 11 is offset with respect to the point of the rotation of the handle 22, and, as such, crank end 11 travels in a circular path that circumscribes this point of rotation. *See id.* Because crank end 11 is engaged with the latch 17, the axial position of the latch 17 is defined by the location of the crank end 11 along its circular path. *See id.* at Figs. 5 and 6. Accordingly, the axial position of the latch 17 is defined by the offset distance between the crank end 11 the handle's 22 point of rotation. Indeed, the diameter of the circular path of travel of the crank end 11 defines the maximum axial displacement of the latch 17. *See id.* at col. 4, ll. 46-49. And in no way does the slot 21 define where the latch 17 of Zaber is located.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Zaber does not disclose all of the features recited in independent claims 17, 20, and 31 and, as such, does not anticipate these claims. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 19, 23, 24, and 32-35 are patentable not only by virtue of their respective dependencies on allowable base claims but also by virtue of the additional features recited therein. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 31-35.

### **Second Section 102 Rejection**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 31-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Kofflin reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,355,917; hereinafter "Kofflin"). Applicants, however, respectfully assert that Kofflin does not disclose all of the features recited in amended independent claims 17, 20, and 31.

For example, Kofflin does not disclose a member with which pivotal actuation of this member in a direction generally tangential to a body actuates a second member in axial direction with respect to the body, as is recited, in a general sense, by independent claims 17, 20, and 31. Rather, Kofflin discloses a handle and clamp assembly that moves in an axial manner, i.e. “up and down.” *See* Kofflin, col. 2, ll. 9-13. Indeed, Kofflin states that “[t]he clamp handles 12 can be moved in an up and down fashion, which in turn moves the rods, which in turn move the hooks 6 and up and down [sic] in order to adjust the adapter body 1 and securely attach the body 1 to the aircraft.” *Id.* (emphasis added). Thus, axial movement of the hooks 6 in the Kofflin device is only effectuated by movement of the handles 12 in an up and down or axial manner. Accordingly, in the Kofflin device, at no time is pivotal motion translated into axial motion.

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Kofflin does not disclose all of the features recited in amended independent claims 17, 20, and 31 and, as such, does not anticipate these claims. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 19, 23, and 32-35 are patentable not only by virtue of their respective dependencies on an allowable base claims but also by virtue of the additional features recited therein. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 31-35.

### **Third Section 102 Rejection**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17, 19, 20, 23, and 31-35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by the Niemi reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,552,333; hereinafter “Niemi”). Applicants, however, respectfully assert that Niemi does not disclose all of the features recited in amended independent claims 17, 20, and 31.

For example, Niemi does not disclose a hook member as is recited in amended independent claims 17, 20, and 31. Rather, Niemi discloses a ball-valve assembly that requires threaded engagement with an inlet tube and an outlet tube. *See* Niemi, Fig. 1 (noting the threaded ends of the Niemi device). In the Niemi device, pivotal actuation of a lever 1 turns a

ball-shaped valve 12 and axially moves a push-pull sleeve 4. *See id* at col. 1, ll. 56-59; col. 4, lines 26-30. This push-pull sleeve 4 operates to prevent balls 9 from rising out of groove 15. *See id* at col. 1, ll. 64-65. Thus, push-pull sleeve 4 is a tubular member that surrounds body member 10. *See, id* at Fig. 1. And no portion of this tubular push-pull sleeve 4 could be equated with a hook member, as is recited in the instant claims.

Thus, Applicants assert that the Niemi reference does not disclose all of the features recited in amended independent claims 17, 20, and 31 and, as such, fails to anticipate these claims. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 19, 23, and 32-35 are patentable not only by virtue of their respective dependencies on allowable base claims but also by virtue of the additional features recited therein. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 17, 19, 20, 23, and 31-35.

#### **Fourth Section 102 Rejection**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19-22, 31 and 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by the Arosio reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,988,697; hereinafter "Arosio"). Applicants, however, respectfully assert that Arosio does not disclose all of the features recited in amended independent claims 1, 8, 17, 20, 31, and 36.

For example, each of the pending independent claims 1, 8, 17, 20, and 31 recites, in a general sense, a hook member that moves axially in response to pivotal movement of another member. By contrast, Arosio does not disclose any semblance of a hook member. Rather, Arosio discloses a mechanism for uniting tubular male and female portions of valves. *See* Arosio, col. 1, ll. 4-8; Fig. 1. The device of Arosio presents a mechanism 1 that includes female coupling halves 2 designed for mated engagement with male halves 3 of a separate. *See, id* at col. 4, ll. 24-26. To effectuate movement of the female halves 2 into engagement with male halves 3, the Arosio device includes a control lever 78 that drives a sliding body 30 of the female half 2 forward. *See, id* at col. 6, ll. 46-56. It is this axial advancement that allows the female half

2 to engage with a male half 3. However, in contrast to the instant claims, neither the male nor female halves, which are both tubular, can reasonably be equated with the hook members recited in the instant claims. Indeed, a tube cannot be equated with a hook.

Additionally, claim 36 recites “first and second securing members configured to secure the body to an aircraft” and “wherein actuation of the first and actuation members...drives the first and second securing members in an axial direction with respect to the body.” (Emphasis added.) Arosio does not disclose these features. Rather, Arosio, as discussed above, discloses a device in which tubular female halves 2 are forwardly driven to engage with corresponding male halves 3 of a separate tubular device. *See* Arosio, col. 1, ll. 4-8; Fig. 1. Although this forward motion is effectuated by pivotal movement of a lever 78, in no way can these tubular female halves 2 of Arosio be equated with the securing members recited in the instant claims. Rather, the female halves 2 of Arosio act merely as mating sleeves for fluidic coupling and in no way act to secure the females halves and male halves to one another.

As another feature not disclosed by Arosio, claim 36 recites first and second actuation members wherein actuation of these members in a direction “generally tangential to the body and in opposite directions with respect to one another drives the first and second securing members in an axial direction with respect to the body.” (Emphasis added.) In stark contrast, Arosio discloses a single lever 78 with which pivotal movement effectuates axial movement of the female halves 2. *See* Arosio, Fig. 1. Indeed, nothing in Arosio suggests the use of two actuation members, let alone two actuation members that move in opposite directions with respect to one another to effectuate movement of another pair of elements in a single axial direction, as is, in a general sense, recited in the instant claims.

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the Arosio reference does not disclose all of the features recited in the instant claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Arosio does not anticipate independent claims 1, 8, 17, 20, 31, and 36. Moreover, Applicants

respectfully assert that dependent claims 2, 5-7, 9-16, 19, 22-25, 32-35, 37 and 38 are patentable not only by virtue of their respective dependencies on allowable base claims but also by virtue of the additional features recited therein. With the foregoing in mind, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19-22, 31, and 35-38.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 2, 12, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of Arosio and Kofflin. Applicants, however, respectfully assert that Arosio and Kofflin, even taken in combination, do not obviate the deficiencies of these references with respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 20, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2, 12, and 25 are patentable not only by virtue of their respective dependencies on allowable base claims but also by virtue of the additional features recited therein. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 2, 12, and 25.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims should be in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner believes certain amendments are necessary to clarify the present claims or if the Examiner wishes to resolve any other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: February 22, 2005

---

Manish B. Vyas  
Reg. No. 54,516  
Fletcher, Yoder  
P.O. Box 692289  
Houston, TX 77269-2289  
(281) 970-4545